

CN 028
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0028



→ copy to John / Done
ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION II
(609) 633-1408
89 AUG -9 PM 11:07

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

HAZARDOUS WASTE
FACILITIES BRANCH

Michele M. Putnam
Deputy Director
Hazardous Waste Operations

John J. Trela, Ph.D., Director

Lance R. Miller
Deputy Director
Responsible Party Remedial Action

CA 89-08/04/89

E.P. Nicholson
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, NJ 07722-5000

AUG 04 1989

Dear Captain Nicholson:

RE: Precious Metals Recovery Unit, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck,
New Jersey, EPA ID NO. NJ 017 002 2172

The Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering (the Bureau) acknowledges the receipt of your letter dated May 23, 1989 in reference to sampling and testing of certain materials for EP Toxicity (silver). These materials are handled at the Precious Metals Recovery Facility at NWS - Earle.

After review of the contents to determine the hazardous waste classification for these materials by the Bureau of Planning and Classification the Department has the following comments:

1. Recovery cartridge samples 3,3L,4L and solution number 1 exceed the maximum allowable concentration for silver E.P. toxicity. Therefore, these samples are classified as hazardous waste, D011.
2. In order to classify the remaining wastes, NWSE shall provide E.P. Toxicity tests for the remaining metals, pH and ignitability for solution number 2. Please provide this information within thirty days of the date of this letter so that the review can be completed.

If you have any questions, please contact Sunila Agrawal at (609) 292-9880.

Very truly your,

Thomas Sherman, Chief
Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering

EP61/cfd

cc: Barry Tornick - USEPA
Frank Farance - Bureau of Case Management
Vincent Krisak - CFO



Handwritten signature: John Trela
ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION II
(609) 633-1408
89 AUG 29 AM 2:47
HAZARDOUS WASTE
FACILITIES BRANCH

CN 028
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0028

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Michele M. Putnam
Deputy Director
Hazardous Waste Operations

John J. Trela, Ph.D., Director

Lance R. Miller
Deputy Director
Responsible Party Remedial Action

E.P. Nicholson
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, N.J. 07722-5000

AUG 23 1989

Dear Captain Nicholson:

RE: Revised Soil Sampling and Analysis Plan for QH-8 and Demil Storage Area, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck, Monmouth County, EPA ID No. NJ 017 002 2172

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has conducted a review of the revised soil sampling and analysis plan dated May 25, 1989 in reference to QH-8 and Demil Storage Area.

The following modifications are required in the soil sampling and analysis plan:

1) Page E-7(4.4)

In addition to utilizing guidance from Chapter 9, volume 2, 3rd edition SW-846 for the sampling program, The NJDEP Field Sampling Procedures Manual should also be referenced.

(4.4.1-d)

All sample parameters except VOA's should be collected from the 0 to 6 inch depth. The VOA fraction is collected from the 6 to 12 inch depth.

2) Page E-14 (4.4.4-1.b.) and Page E-39a

Field blanks shall consist of two sets of identical containers. The water from the full set of containers shall be poured through decontaminated sampling equipment into the empty set of containers.

Field and trip blank samples must arrive on-site within one day of their preparation in the lab, may be held on-site for no longer than two calendar days, and must arrive back in the lab within one

AUG 23 1989

day of shipment from the field (4 days total). Blanks and all samples must be maintained at 4°C while on-site and during shipment.

3) Page E-15 (4.4.4-3c)

To ensure that the proper level of extraction and analysis is conducted, the laboratories should screen all samples prior to analyses. The screening results must be maintained by the laboratory until the analytical results are approved by NJDEP. NJDEP may require the submittal of the screening analytical results if the laboratory utilized the high level extraction procedure or analyses and reports all analytical results as "Non Detect". If NJDEP determines that the use of the high level extraction and analyses was inappropriate, resampling will be required and analysis conducted utilizing the low level procedures.

The use of GPC procedure for semivolatile analysis is not permitted.

The use of non-aqueous method blanks (except for dioxin in soils) is unacceptable to NJDEP. A volume of deionized/distilled laboratory water should be utilized instead as per requirements of the USEPA SOW for Organics Analysis.

All Deliverables shall be securely bound along the left margin.

Data results must be reported according to the latest version of USEPA CLP-Tier I format deliverables requirement if SOW for Organics and Inorganics Analysis is utilized. If 3rd edition SW-846 methodologies are used, then at a minimum, results must meet the deliverables format requirements as specified in the 3rd edition SW-846 (Attached).

4) Page E-36 (4.4.1-1.d.)

It is recommended that a minimum of three volumes and a maximum of five volumes be purged from a monitoring well prior to sampling.

Please provide Page E-37 and E-38 of the SSAP.

5) Page E-39 (4.4.4.)

The submersible pump deionized/distilled water final rinse is for the pump exterior.

AUG 23 1989

Any questions regarding soil sampling and analysis plan shall be addressed to Denise K. Bear at (609) 984-1693. Any other questions shall be addressed to Sunila Agrawal at (609) 292-9880.

Very truly yours,



Thomas Sherman, Chief
Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering

EP61/dbm
Attachment

c: Barry Tornick - USEPA
Frank Faranca - Bureau of Case Management
Vincent Krisak - CFO

DOCUMENT: CAPTAIN
FOLDER: LXMMCB



JUL 6 1990

B1

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

CN 028
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0028
(609) 633-1408
Fax # (609) 633-1454

NJ0170022172

JUN 29 1990

E.P. Nicholson
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer
Department of the Navy
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722

RE: Soil Sampling and Analytical Plan (SSAP) Building QH-8, Demil Storage Area and EOD Range, Revision October 1989, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck, Monmouth County, EPA ID No. NJD 017 002 2172.

Dear Mr. Nicholson:

The Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering (BHWE) has reviewed the SSAP for the above referenced facility and approves the plan with the following modifications:

Section 4.3, Page E-7 and E-27

Site evaluations using TCLP to determine EP toxicity are useful only for disposal determinations and not for further environmental impact studies of the site.

Table 2, Page E-8

Method 3540 for TPHC analysis and method reference (1) for water and wastes are not acceptable for soils analysis. See RCRA attachment III (attached) for the required methods for use.

Section 4.4.2, Page E-14 and Section 4.4.4, Page E-39

The aluminum foil utilized to wrap decontaminated sampling equipment shall be autoclaved.

The acetone used in the decontamination sequence shall be pesticide grade.

Section 4.4.4, Page E-15

In addition to the laboratory procedures specified, the detection limits for SW-846 3rd edition methodologies shall be as indicated in RCRA Attachment III pages C-1 through C-6.



Section 4.4.1-3.;. Page E-37

JUN 29 1990

The comment "decontaminate the bailer according to Section 4.4.4" shall be deleted, as bailers are not decontaminated in the field after sample collection.

Section 4.4.2 - 1. a. Page E-37

Surface water samples may be collected directly into the sample containers as an alternative to the methods specified.

Section 4.4.2 -2. Page E-37 and Section 4.4.3, Page E-38

All required sample containers shall be prepared and provided by the laboratory performing the analysis.

Section 3, Page E-40

In addition to the laboratory methodologies indicated, please note that the laboratory must follow all RCRA Attachment III procedures.

BHWE must be notified in writing at least fourteen (14) days prior to initiation of closure sampling activities so that a representative from the Department could be present to audit the soil sampling episode..

If you have any questions, please call John Scott of my staff at (609) 292-9880.

Very truly yours,



Thomas Sherman, Chief
Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering

EP58/cfd
One(1) Attachment
cc: Barry Tornick, USEPA
Vincent Krisak, BCE

DOCUMENT: NAVAL16
FOLDER: DBMMCB

RCRA ATTACHMENT III

Laboratory Procedures

The laboratory SOP must be submitted with the proposed Sampling Plan unless the SOP is already on file with the Office of Quality Assurance.

Parameters for analysis must be from the Target Compound List (TCL) plus thirty and the Target Analyte List (TAL). Any facility specific compounds not included on the TCL or TAL should have the analytical SOP included with the plan.

The laboratory conducting the soil analysis must utilize CLP SOW for Organics and Inorganics Analysis or SW-846, 3rd edition methodologies. SW-846 methods to be utilized include: Method 8240 for volatiles; Method 8270 for semivolatiles; methods for other parameters should be specified. For soil analysis of TPHC, EPA method 418.1 as modified by NJDEP should be utilized. Minimum detection limits for both CLP and SW-846 analytical protocols are provided as pages C-1 through C-6.

Data results must be reported according to the Regulatory Deliverable format (Appendix 1) that is to be utilized for analyses conducted by SW-846 3rd Edition. The NJDEP-CLP Format (Appendix 3) is to be utilized for analyses of samples analyzed by Contract Laboratory Program Protocol. The 3rd edition SW-846 is utilizing CLP type deliverables for the analysis of samples by certain methods. The use of NJDEP-CLP format for these methods is acceptable. (Examples of Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 may be obtained from BHWE.)

The submittal of Inorganics data must include all raw data and the QA/QC data required for the method. Submittal of only the results and the summary sheet information is not acceptable. Information reported by the laboratory for TPHC analysis should include: calibration data, method blank results, samples results, date of analysis, and IR spectra for calibration standards, all blanks, all samples.

To ensure that the proper level of extraction and analysis is conducted, the laboratories should screen all samples prior to analyses. The screening results must be maintained by the laboratory until the analytical results are approved by NJDEP. NJDEP may require the submittal of the screening analytical results if the laboratory utilized the high level extraction procedure or analyses and reports all analytical results as "Non Detect". If NJDEP determines that the use of the high level extraction and analyses was inappropriate, resampling will be required and analysis conducted utilizing the low level procedures.

The use of GPC procedure for semivolatile analysis is not permitted.

The use of non-aqueous method blanks (except for dioxin in soils) is unacceptable to NJDEP. A volume of deionized/distilled laboratory water should be utilized instead as per requirements of the USEPA SOW for Organics Analysis.

All deliverables are to be securely bound along the left margin.

INORGANIC TARGET ANALYTE LIST (TAL)

Analyte	Contract Required Detection Limit (1,2) (ug/L)
Aluminum	200
Antimony	60
Arsenic	10
Barium	200
Beryllium	5
Cadmium	5
Calcium	5000
Chromium	10
Cobalt	50
Copper	25
Iron	100
Lead	5
Magnesium	5000
Manganese	15
Mercury	0.2
Nickel	40
Potassium	5000
Selenium	5
Silver	10
Sodium	5000
Thallium	10
Vanadium	50
Zinc	20
Cyanide	10

- (1) Subject to the restrictions specified in the first page of Part G, Section IV of Exhibit D (Alternate Methods - Catastrophic Failure) any analytical method specified in SOW Exhibit D may be utilized as long as the documented instrument or method detection limits meet the Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL) requirements. Higher detection limits may only be used in the following circumstance:

If the sample concentration exceeds five times the detection limit of the instrument or method in use, the value may be reported even though the instrument or method detection limit may not equal the Contract Required Detection Limit. This is illustrated in the example below:

For lead:

Method in use - ICP

Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) - 40

Sample concentration - 220

Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL) - 5

Target Compound List (TCL) and
Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQL)*

Volatiles	CAS Number	Quantitation Limits**	
		Water ug/L	Low Soil/Sediment ^a ug/Kg
1. Chloromethane	74-87-3	10	10
2. Bromomethane	74-83-9	10	10
3. Vinyl Chloride	75-01-4	10	10
4. Chloroethane	75-00-3	10	10
5. Methylene Chloride	75-09-2	5	5
6. Acetone	67-64-1	10	10
7. Carbon Disulfide	75-15-0	5	5
8. 1,1-Dichloroethene	75-35-4	5	5
9. 1,1-Dichloroethane	75-34-3	5	5
10. 1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	540-59-0	5	5
11. Chloroform	67-66-3	5	5
12. 1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	5	5
13. 2-Butanone	78-93-3	10	10
14. 1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71-55-6	5	5
15. Carbon Tetrachloride	56-23-5	5	5
16. Vinyl Acetate	108-05-4	10	10
17. Bromodichloromethane	75-27-4	5	5
18. 1,2-Dichloropropane	78-87-5	5	5
19. cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	10061-01-5	5	5
20. Trichloroethene	79-01-6	5	5
21. Dibromochloromethane	124-48-1	5	5
22. 1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79-00-5	5	5
23. Benzene	71-43-2	5	5
24. trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	10061-02-6	5	5
25. Bromoform	75-25-2	5	5
26. 4-Methyl-2-pentanone	108-10-1	10	10
27. 2-Hexanone	591-78-6	10	10
28. Tetrachloroethene	127-18-4	5	5
29. Toluene	108-88-3	5	5
30. 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79-34-5	5	5

(continued)

Volatiles	CAS Number	Quantitation Limits**	
		Water	Low Soil/Sediment ^a
		ug/L	ug/Kg
31. Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	5	5
32. Ethyl Benzene	100-41-4	5	5
33. Styrene	100-42-5	5	5
34. Xylenes (Total)	1330-20-7	5	5

^a Medium Soil/Sediment Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQL) for Volatile TCL Compounds are 125 times the individual Low Soil/Sediment CRQL.

* Specific quantitation limits are highly matrix dependent. The quantitation limits listed herein are provided for guidance and may not always be achievable.

** Quantitation limits listed for soil/sediment are based on wet weight. The quantitation limits calculated by the laboratory for soil/sediment, calculated on dry weight basis as required by the contract, will be higher.

Target Compound List (TCL) and
Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CROL)*

Semivolatiles	CAS Number	Quantitation Limits**	
		Water ug/L	Low Soil/Sediment ^b ug/Kg
35. Phenol	108-95-2	10	330
36. bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	111-44-4	10	330
37. 2-Chlorophenol	95-57-8	10	330
38. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541-73-1	10	330
39. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	10	330
40. Benzyl alcohol	100-51-6	10	330
41. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95-50-1	10	330
42. 2-Methylphenol	95-48-7	10	330
43. bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) ether	108-60-1	10	330
44. 4-Methylphenol	106-44-5	10	330
45. N-Nitroso-di-n- dipropylamine	621-64-7	10	330
46. Hexachloroethane	67-72-1	10	330
47. Nitrobenzene	98-95-3	10	330
48. Isophorone	78-59-1	10	330
49. 2-Nitrophenol	88-75-5	10	330
50. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	105-67-9	10	330
51. Benzoic acid	65-85-0	50	1600
52. bis(2-Chloroethoxy) methane	111-91-1	10	330
53. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	120-83-2	10	330
54. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120-82-1	10	330
55. Naphthalene	91-20-3	10	330
56. 4-Chloroaniline	106-47-8	10	330
57. Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3	10	330
58. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol (para-chloro-meta-cresol)	59-50-7	10	330
59. 2-Methylnaphthalene	91-57-6	10	330
60. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	77-47-4	10	330
61. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88-06-2	10	330
62. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	95-95-4	50	1600
63. 2-Chloronaphthalene	91-58-7	10	330
64. 2-Nitroaniline	88-74-4	50	1600
65. Dimethylphthalate	131-11-3	10	330
66. Acenaphthylene	208-96-8	10	330
67. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	606-20-2	10	330
68. 3-Nitroaniline	99-09-2	50	1600
69. Acenaphthene	83-32-9	10	330

(continued)

Semivolatiles	CAS Number	Quantitation Limits**	
		Water ug/L	Low Soil/Sediment ^b ug/Kg
70. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	51-28-5	50	1600
71. 4-Nitrophenol	100-02-7	50	1600
72. Dibenzofuran	132-64-9	10	330
73. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	121-14-2	10	330
74. Diethylphthalate	84-66-2	10	330
75. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	7005-72-3	10	330
76. Fluorene	86-73-7	10	330
77. 4-Nitroaniline	100-01-6	50	1600
78. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	534-52-1	50	1600
79. N-nitrosodiphenylamine	86-30-6	10	330
80. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	101-55-3	10	330
81. Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	10	330
82. Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	50	1600
83. Phenanthrene	85-01-8	10	330
84. Anthracene	120-12-7	10	330
85. Di-n-butylphthalate	84-74-2	10	330
86. Fluoranthene	206-44-0	10	330
87. Pyrene	129-00-0	10	330
88. Butylbenzylphthalate	85-68-7	10	330
89. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1	20	660
90. Benzo(a)anthracene	56-55-3	10	330
91. Chrysene	218-01-9	10	330
92. bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate	117-81-7	10	330
93. Di-n-octylphthalate	117-84-0	10	330
94. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	10	330
95. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	10	330
96. Benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8	10	330
97. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	193-39-5	10	330
98. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	53-70-3	10	330
99. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	191-24-2	10	330

^b Medium Soil/Sediment Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQL) for SemiVolatile TCL Compounds are 60 times the individual Low Soil/Sediment CRQL.

* Specific quantitation limits are highly matrix dependent. The quantitation limits listed herein are provided for guidance and may not always be achievable.

** Quantitation limits listed for soil/sediment are based on wet weight. The quantitation limits calculated by the laboratory for soil/sediment, calculated on dry weight basis as required by the contract, will be higher.

Target Compound List (TCL) and
Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQL)*

Pesticides/PCBs	CAS Number	Quantitation Limits**	
		Water ug/L	Low Soil/Sediment ^c ug/Kg
100. alpha-BHC	319-84-6	0.05	8.0
101. beta-BHC	319-85-7	0.05	8.0
102. delta-BHC	319-86-8	0.05	8.0
103. gamma-BHC (Lindane)	58-89-9	0.05	8.0
104. Heptachlor	76-44-8	0.05	8.0
105. Aldrin	309-00-2	0.05	8.0
106. Heptachlor epoxide	1024-57-3	0.05	8.0
107. Endosulfan I	959-98-8	0.05	8.0
108. Dieldrin	60-57-1	0.10	16.0
109. 4,4'-DDE	72-55-9	0.10	16.0
110. Endrin	72-20-8	0.10	16.0
111. Endosulfan II	33213-65-9	0.10	16.0
112. 4,4'-DDD	72-54-8	0.10	16.0
113. Endosulfan sulfate	1031-07-8	0.10	16.0
114. 4,4'-DDT	50-29-3	0.10	16.0
115. Methoxychlor	72-43-5	0.5	80.0
116. Endrin ketone	53494-70-5	0.10	16.0
117. alpha-Chlordane	5103-71-9	0.5	80.0
118. gamma-Chlordane	5103-74-2	0.5	80.0
119. Toxaphene	8001-35-2	1.0	160.0
120. Aroclor-1016	12674-11-2	0.5	80.0
121. Aroclor-1221	11104-28-2	0.5	80.0
122. Aroclor-1232	11141-16-5	0.5	80.0
123. Aroclor-1242	53469-21-9	0.5	80.0
124. Aroclor-1248	12672-29-6	0.5	80.0
125. Aroclor-1254	11097-69-1	1.0	160.0
126. Aroclor-1260	11096-82-5	1.0	160.0

^c Medium Soil/Sediment Contract Required Quantitation Limits (CRQL) for Pesticide/PCB TCL compounds are 15 times the individual Low Soil/Sediment CRQL.

* Specific quantitation limits are highly matrix dependent. The quantitation limits listed herein are provided for guidance and may not always be achievable.

** Quantitation limits listed for soil/sediment are based on wet weight. The quantitation Limits calculated by the laboratory for soil/sediment, calculated on dry weight basis as required by the contract, will be higher.



State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection and Energy

Environmental Regulation
Hazardous Waste Regulation Program

CN 028
Trenton, NJ 08625-0028

Scott A. Weiner
Commissioner

Frank Coolick
Administrator

JUN 11 REC'D

JUN 08 1992

Gregory Goepfert
Environmental Director
Department of the Navy
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722-5000

RE: Annual Soil Sampling and Analyses, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck, Monmouth County, EPA ID No. NJ0 170 022 172, NJ Facility No. 1309A1

Dear Mr. Goepfert:

The Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering in conjunction with its support group the Bureau of Environmental Measurements and Quality Assurance has completed its review of the analytical data for soil samples collected on February 27, 1991 in accordance with the annual soil sampling and analysis requirements of your hazardous waste facility permit.

The Department has determined that the laboratory performing the analysis failed to provide a Regulatory Format deliverable package for the explosive compounds. This fraction has been conditionally rejected pending resubmittal of the data in the proper format.

Please submit the requested information within thirty (30) days from the date of this letter.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call John P. Scott of my staff at (609) 292-9880.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Sherman, Chief
Bureau Hazardous Waste Engineering

EP58/js

c: Michael Poetzsch, USEPA, Region II
Charles L. Maack, CBWHWEFO

DOCUMENT: GEOPFERT
FOLDER: JXSMCB



12/7 UC

**State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection and Energy**

Environmental Regulation
Hazardous Waste Regulation Program
CN 421

Scott A. Weiner
Commissioner

Trenton, NJ 08625-0421
Phone# 609-633-1418

Frank Coolick
Administrator

Gregory Goepfert
Environmental Director
Department of the Navy
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722-5000

DEC 03 1992

RE: Soil Sampling Data Review for the Closure of the Two Thousand Gallon Waste Oil Storage Tank Located West of Building C-14, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck, Monmouth County, EPA ID No. NJ0 170 022 172, CP-86-1

Dear Mr. Goepfert:

The Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering (Bureau) in conjunction with its support group the Bureau of Environmental Measurements and Quality Assurance has completed a review of the soil sampling data collected on February 14, 1991 in accordance with the March 24, 1987 subsequently amended December 5, 1990 approved closure plan for the two thousand gallon waste oil tank located west of Building C-14.

The review of the soil sampling data has indicated that the concentrations of the parameters that were tested for were either not detected or below levels of concern. Naval Weapons Station Earle (NWSE) is hereby advised that the closure activities for this unit have been completed to the satisfaction of the Department. Therefore, this unit does not require future action by NWSE or this Bureau.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call John P. Scott of my staff at (609) 292-9880.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Sherman, Chief
Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering

EP58/cfd

cc: Michael Poetzsch, USEPA, Region II
Charles L. Maack, CBWHWEFO

DOCUMENT: USARMY27
FOLDER: CFDMOB



**State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection and Energy**

Environmental Regulation
Hazardous Waste Regulation Program
CN 421

Scott A. Weiner
Commissioner

Trenton, NJ 08625-0421
Phone# 609-633-1418

Frank Coolick
Administrator

APR 29 1993

Gregory Goepfert
Environmental Director
Department of the Navy
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722-5000

RE: Annual Soil Sampling Data Review, Naval Weapons Station Earle, Colts Neck, Monmouth County, EPA ID No. NJ0 170 022 172, NJ Hazardous Waste Facility Permit 1309A1HP01

Dear Mr. Goepfert:

The Bureau of Hazardous Waste Engineering (Bureau) in conjunction with its support group the Bureau of Environmental Measurements and Quality Assurance has completed a preliminary review of the soil sampling data collected on December 29, 1992, in accordance with Condition 7(c), Section II of your hazardous waste facility permit.

The review indicates that the following information is missing and must be submitted to the Bureau for the Department to complete the review of the data:

General

The non-detected results reported by the laboratory were not listed on the target and non-target summary lists.

The laboratory did not provide the internal chain-of-custody and methodology followed for the Pesticide/PCB analyses.

Pesticides/PCBs

The summary of the results reported on the form entitled "Report of Results" indicates that the analyses were performed by Method 8080. The analytical sequence and % D values for DBC retention times for the standards and the samples have not been included in the data package. The initial calibration did not have five concentration levels of the standards for the analytes of interest as per Method 8080.

The raw data indicate that the analyses were performed following USEPA CLP methodology and the standards include Performance Evaluation Standards. However, the deliverables are not consistent with the CLP format.